ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/1/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3 IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000840	8357		

4. AUTHOR(S):
Medalia, N.Z.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
On Becoming A College Teacher: A Review of Three Variables (Research Monograph No. 6)

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Southern Regional Edu. Board

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Southern Regional Edu. Board
ST. 130 Sixth St., NW
CITY, STATE Atlanta, Georgia
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	63	42

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

teachers Y-21	prestige P-18			
careers R-41	aspirations R-19			
research P-37				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A review and assessment of research bearing upon the career development of college teachers, designed to summarize the current status of this field of research and to suggest appropriate direction for future research. Concentration is on three variables: career decision, occupational image, and institutional potency.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

R-7
8357

SREB RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NUMBER 6

AUG 7 - 1963

ED 000 840

ON BECOMING A COLLEGE TEACHER

A REVIEW OF THREE VARIABLES

by N. Z. MEDALIA

SREB RESEARCH
MONOGRAPH
NUMBER 6

8357

ON BECOMING A COLLEGE TEACHER

A REVIEW OF THREE VARIABLES

by N. Z. MEDALIA

SOUTHERN REGIONAL
EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta 13, Georgia

1963

**Financed in part by funds
made available through a
grant from the Carnegie Corporation**

FOREWORD

In the years ahead higher education in the South will be only as good as our college and university faculties. For this reason, the selection and preparation of college teachers is among the most important challenges we face.

The Southern Regional Education Board has supported several projects relating to the career development of college teachers, among them the study of *The Career Decisions of College Teachers* by John W. Gustad to which reference is made in this monograph. Because of SREB's continued interest in such studies, Dr. Nahum Z. Medalia, formerly of Georgia Institute of Technology, was asked to prepare a background paper concerning research on faculty recruitment and retention which could be used during an SREB sponsored seminar (participants listed in appendix).

Following the seminar, Dr. Medalia revised and up-dated the paper for publication in its present form. It is a review and assessment of research bearing upon the career development of college teachers, designed to summarize the current status of this field of research and to suggest appropriate directions for future research. Although it includes an enumeration of significant studies, this review is not meant to be exhaustive.

Unless Southern colleges and universities are adequately staffed in the coming decades, the quality of education will decline rather than grow. The region lags behind the nation in the adequacy of faculty staffing, and to reduce this lag will mean continued and concentrated attention to the matter of recruiting, training and retaining outstanding young people for college teaching.

Winfred L. Godwin
Director
Southern Regional Education Board

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their encouragement, advice, and above all, patience, in the process of preparing this review, I would like to thank Dr. John Folger, and Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., former and present Associate Directors for Research, SREB, respectively; and Drs. E. F. Schietinger and Kenneth Wilson, SREB. Although they undoubtedly would not endorse all of the interpretations or conclusions in this review, I am grateful to them for the opportunity to write it and for their willingness to provide a forum for views on faculty recruitment research that may prove somewhat controversial.

Nahum Z. Medalia, Executive Secretary
Small Research Grants Study Section
Research and Fellowships Branch
National Institute of Mental Health

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Introduction	ix
Choice of a College Teaching Career: The Career Decision	1
Commitment to an Occupational Identity	13
The Academic Image	19
Institutional Potency and Faculty Recruitment	27
References	37
Appendix	41

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

INTRODUCTION

This review selects for detailed examination three variables widely used in study of recruitment to college faculty roles: the "career decision," the "occupational image," and "institutional potency." It neglects others that may be of equal or even greater significance towards understanding the total faculty recruitment process — for example, those of personality development — and it will consider only in passing the process of adult socialization associated with professional training in specialized disciplines. However, some selection has to be made, and the variables considered here seem to focus in a general way on the same stage in the recruitment or selection process for college faculty: the years of undergraduate preparation.

Regarding the social significance or practical importance of the problem under discussion, *i.e.*, recruitment of college faculty, this review does not assume that there is a shortage or surplus, present or impending, of college teachers, and offers only the suggestion that the whole controversy and concern over the "shortage" of faculty has operated to obscure what should be our real concern: the shortage of college learning rather than that of college teaching. On the other hand, the principal assumption which this review does make has to do with the value of conceptual clarity in the study of recruitment to occupations such as the academic. Its principal object is, hopefully, to contribute to such clarity and to raise questions for future research in terms of the three variables under discussion.

CHOICE OF A COLLEGE TEACHING CAREER: THE CAREER DECISION

The two major studies of recruitment to college faculty roles which use "career decisions" as the key variable are those of John Gustad, *The Career Decisions of College Teachers,*[1] and of Ruth Eckert and John Stecklein, *An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career.*[2] These studies focus on the individual and try to learn something of when and how he makes up his mind to go into teaching, and what factors he perceives as having influenced his decision; in addition, they attempt to relate the individual's decision to remain in, or to leave, the teaching field with the satisfactions and dissatisfactions that he actually experiences in his work. What do these studies tell us regarding the process of recruitment to college teaching, what do we learn from them concerning the "morale" of college teachers, and what issues do they pose for future research in terms of the "career decisions" variable?

Concerning the process whereby entry into college teaching is effected, Stecklein and Eckert say: "College teachers seem to have entered this field more by accident than by deliberate design. By and large, they did not look forward during their undergraduate years, as young people entering other professions do, to working in the field in which they are currently engaged" (p. 44). Similarly, according to Gustad: "By and large . . . entry into (college) teaching is the end product of drift. That is, the majority do not engage in the kind of

career planning that is typical of the aspiring physician or attorney" (p. 6). These authors then agree substantially that college teachers seem to have backed into their faculty roles, although Gustad enters the proviso that such career "decisions" are not made by chance as Stecklein-Eckert would imply: "It is safer to say that this individual, even though he may not have thought much about it, will, when faced with the decision, choose that alternative that is most compatible to him because he is the kind of person he is" (p. 6).*

Concerning the satisfactions that college teachers derive from their careers once they have entered upon them, Gustad and Stecklein-Eckert appear, however, to reach opposite conclusions. From his study, Gustad found that teachers tended to be uncertain as to what would constitute an ideal job for them (p. 32); that "only about a third" of college teachers expect to attain their ultimately desired occupational goals in their present institution (p. 44); that the widespread feeling among teachers that their work is not valued or appreciated "constitutes a serious problem" (p. 42) and quite likely "is a symptom . . . of a generally poor morale" (p. 43); and that "the conditions of work in college teaching are in a pitiable state of affairs" (p. 33). Stecklein-Eckert's college teachers by contrast seem to be and to have a much happier lot. According to their study: "Faculty members reported many different kinds of satisfactions from their professional service. Rather significantly these expressed satisfactions tended to center around the kinds of tasks the teacher performs, whereas the reported dissatisfactions, which were far fewer in number, had mostly to do with the lack of suitable rewards or appreciation for such services" (p. 42, Stecklein-Eckert). Reviewing these satisfactions, Stecklein and Eckert say that their research "corroborates earlier findings regarding the generally high morale of college teachers" (p. 46).

Correspondingly, Gustad and Stecklein-Eckert differ in their evaluation of what should be done to attract and keep more people in college teaching. Stecklein-Eckert would, to paraphrase Blake, publicize more widely "how sweet is the teacher's sweet lot" and how important (p. 46); in addition, they would improve his lot still further by paying him more for fewer contract hours. Gustad, on the other hand, doesn't believe that the college teacher's lot is particularly happy, as things stand today; and his recommendations for reform have a somewhat tragic ring.

---

* Since this review has made no attempt to consider systematically the personality variable in occupational recruitment or selection, it will not comment on Gustad's contention that college teachers are a breed apart, personality-wise, other than to say that his hypothesis would seem to require, for its substantiation, at least two sorts of controls: 1) Ph.D.'s in Chemistry, English, and Psychology who never took college teaching jobs; 2) undergraduates in colleges similar to those where present teachers graduated, who never took teaching jobs. Absence of the first control group would make it impossible to prove that former teachers left teaching because they were dissatisfied with it or because they were like the kind of person who never enters it; absence of the second control, impossible to prove that teachers are different in any way from their college peers (*e.g.*, more solitary).

For example, it seems fair to say, on Gustad's assumptions, that "the personnel problems of higher educators would remain the same even if unlimited funds were available" (p. 6). On the other hand, given the kind of person who goes into college teaching, how are we, in Gustad's words, "to effect changes in the image of college teaching as a career and college teachers as people" (p. 47)? If according to him the image of "the absent minded professor . . . disporting himself with dangerously subversive or at best useless ideas" is not true (p. 47), then how can it be true that the college professor is a person who "develops early in life a preference for largely solitary and intellectually stimulating activities in preference to the goals characteristic of his peers" (p. 6)? How can communication between administrators and faculty be improved (p. 47) if the former represent precisely the values of the peer group which closed its ranks against the embryo professor? Finally, how can the morale of a college faculty be improved if, as Gustad says, "the key to morale is the group"; and the professor is an essentially solitary being (p. 48)? Compared to these difficulties, finding a way to teach our society "that a man is not measured by the size of his bank account," as Gustad also recommends (p. 47) seems almost easy.

This summary comparison between the studies of Gustad and Stecklein-Eckert raises the following questions:

1. **What accounts for the major difference in over-all evaluation of college faculty members' morale, as between these two studies?** The following comments are offered not as answers to this question, but as possible leads for finding an answer.

   A. Differences in morale as a function of differences in sample constitution. Among the most salient differences in constitution of Stecklein-Eckert and Gustad's samples are these: **(a)** Type of college included: Stecklein-Eckert included junior colleges, Gustad included (or at least reported on) only four-year institutions and universities; **(b)** Subject areas: Stecklein-Eckert included faculty in all college fields, Gustad only in three; **(c)** Sex ratio: Gustad reports attitudes only of male faculty, whereas in Stecklein-Eckert's study 30 per cent of returns came from women teachers; **(d)** Stecklein-Eckert's study concerns mainly (67 per cent) native Middle-Westerners teaching in Middle-Western colleges, while Gustad's subjects were preponderantly (45 per cent) native Southerners teaching in the South; **(e)** Stecklein-Eckert report on the response of 94 per cent of their sample of four-year college faculty and on the universe of junior college faculty, Gustad on returns from 60 per cent of his sample of present teachers; **(f)** 44 per cent of the faculty in Stecklein-

Eckert's four-year colleges and 4 per cent in their junior colleges held the doctorate, whereas 80 per cent of Gustad's sample had obtained this degree.

Some of these differences in sample constitution would appear to make the difference in faculty morale as evaluated by these two studies, err on the conservative side. Thus, Stecklein-Eckert's junior college faculty were the lowest in morale of their entire study population; and one would suspect (on a *verstehende* basis) a high proportion of low morale teachers lurking among the non-respondents to Gustad's questionnaire. Other differences would appear to be irrelevant or of indirect relevance to the evaluated difference in morale (c and d); still others self-cancelling in their operation on the morale factor (b). By elimination, it would appear that only one difference in sample constitution as between these two studies — that of the ratio of doctorate to non-doctorate faculty — bears directly on our question.

B. Difference in time and method of data collection. Stecklein-Eckert sampled opinions of college faculty in the fall of 1956, a little over a year before Gustad's sampling (fall '57 to spring '58). This difference does not appear to be of any significance. On the other hand, to secure 94 per cent response, Stecklein-Eckert seem to have hammered harder at college faculty through administrative channels than did Gustad. Whether the administrative and inter-organizational ties which made this hammering possible exerted an independent influence upon response and if so in what direction so far as reported satisfaction of faculty members with their jobs is concerned, may be an open question. Also open is the question of the extent to which researchers concerned with attitudes of bureaucratic employees are up against a double bind: to obtain statistically meaningful results they must secure responses ideally from all individuals in their sample, but the only methods available for approximating this ideal may be those which influence significantly the opinions that are being sampled.

C. Differences in meaning of morale. Conceptual incongruity is, of course, the most frequent stumbling block to anyone who would make comparative analyses of studies on any given social science topic. Gustad's definition of faculty morale is at the same time more sophisticated and less clear-cut than Steckleln-Eckert's, resting as it does on an analysis of interview material and an analysis of the expected, actual, and desired rewards of college teachers from their work. Stecklein-Eckert, on the other hand, evaluate morale operationally in terms of (a) Responses of faculty to the questionnaire item, "Please check

the expression below which best describes your present attitude toward college teaching as a career: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, indifferent, satisfied, very satisfied." Ninety-two per cent of the faculty in the four-year institutions said they were "very satisfied" or "satisfied." (b) The fact that faculty members reported far more "satisfactions" than "dissatisfactions" with their work (p. 42). (c) The fact that 83 per cent of their respondents (about the same proportion as Gustad's) said they would choose again to remain in teaching if they could remake their choice (p. 26).

It appears from this analysis that any attempt to compare Gustad's study with Stecklein-Eckert's, on the vital question of how well satisfied college faculty members are with their work, is a shaky undertaking. This experience points up the need for (1) building in some basis for comparability between successive studies on approximately the same problem; (2) employing more internally consistent and psychologically sound measures of "morale"; (For example, the fact that in Stecklein-Eckhert's study 10 per cent more respondents said they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with college teaching as a career, than said they would "choose again to remain in it," raises a question about what it means to be "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with teaching. Also Stecklein-Eckert's measure "b" rests on the extremely dubious assumption that all reported "satisfactions" and "dissatisfactions" of teachers with teaching have the same psychological value.) (3) attempting to place findings concerning morale or job satisfaction of different groups of workers within the context of systematic theory rather than of *ad hoc* explanation. Consider, for example, Stecklein-Eckert's finding that ". . . private liberal arts teachers (experienced) the greatest degree of satisfaction among faculty in four-year institutions, and the University of Minnesota faculty the least . . . . Junior college teachers in general seemed to be somewhat less happy about their current career roles, illustrated by the fact that only 31 per cent of them expressed the high satisfaction shown by half of the teachers in four-year colleges" (p. 26). Stecklein-Eckert explain the relative unhappiness of junior college teachers by saying that "they felt they were not enjoying the full status of college faculty members" (p. 43), since their activities were more like those of secondary school teachers. But this does not explain the relatively low satisfaction with college teaching as a career of the University of Minnesota faculty who do enjoy presumably the full status of college faculty.

2. Is recruitment to college teaching by decision or by drift?

The second main question raised by this comparison between Stecklein-Eckert and Gustad's studies concerns their characterization of the way in which college faculty enter their occupation. Does the agreement of these studies on the view that college faculty tend to "drift" into occupational roles mean something more or less real than their disagreement concerning the satisfactions that faculty members derive from playing those roles? And what are the implications for research on recruitment to occupational roles, more generally, of the decision-drift schema?

Let us note to begin with that "drift" is a term with ideological overtones. In view of America's long-standing "romance with practicality" (Barzun) a drifter is, to say the least, un-American; yet an occasional heretic will arise to proclaim the goodness of drift. Such a one is Trow, whose stimulating essay, "Reflections on the Recruitment to College Teaching,"[8] contains a passage which in effect equates career selection by "drift" with receptivity to learning; while its opposite, which Trow calls a hardening of occupational identity," is associated with an isomorphic hardening of the intellectual arteries. Says Trow:

> Vocationally or career-oriented students are far less susceptible to influences in colleges which would modify their opinion or basic life choices. Students whose identities have hardened early cannot be reached as deeply as students who are still engaged in what Eric Erikson calls "identity play," and particularly not where higher education must reach them deeply enough to make them want to give their lives to it (p. 59).

Trow, in addition, relates entry to college teaching by "drift" with two further considerations of far-reaching significance: first teachers' social class origins; secondly, quality of role performance as college teacher. On both counts, the drifters come out on top:

> When lower and lower middle class people do want their children to go to college . . . they first perceive a college education as . . . purely advanced vocational training. And their children share their views. Now I suspect that students who view their college education as vocational training will not contribute the number or more importantly the *kind* of college teachers that we want. The view of college education as vocational training usually means that an early choice of career has been made. But to become a college teacher, as we have seen, is typically the outcome of a deferred career choice. The early career choices of the vocationally oriented

> usually foreclose the possibilities of "drifting" into college teaching (p. 58).

Here we witness, of course, another engagement in the perennial war between educational generalists and educational specialists, which leaves students in a damned if you do, damned if you don't position. To the generalist, the student who comes to college to prepare for a preconceived occupational role is rigid, hardened, impervious to anything but a narrow range of applied intellectual fare. To the specialist, the student who comes to college without a clear-cut idea of what, occupationally speaking, he wants to be is a drifter who should be shown the error of his ways by vocational guidance and other arts of the student personnel service. This as a matter of fact is the position taken by both Gustad and Stecklein-Eckert when they recommend improved guidance as one obvious possibility for recruiting more college teachers. Thus Gastad: " . . . it is . . . quite likely that by our casual attitude towards recruiting our successors we are losing many promising potential teachers. Improved guidance is one obvious possibility" (p. 47).

Now one can no more take issue with "improved guidance" as an educational objective than one can with "better teaching"; but the foregoing discussion leaves this reviewer at any rate with the distinct impression that for Trow and his like the way to improve guidance for the potential recruit to college teaching is to abolish it entirely in order to allow him maximum freedom for his "identity play."

So much for the first set of issues raised by the characterization of recruitment to college teaching as the outcome of "drift": namely, is drift good or bad? Do we want more or less of it? Is it the lower classes or the upper classes who tend to drift into their occupations? Is one a better college teacher for having so drifted? Is there a psychological connection between engaging in "identity play" and "receptivity to college education," even to that zenith of receptivity represented by the willingness to devote one's life to college teaching? Is there a psychological rather than tautological connection between hardening of identity and resistance to the full benefits of higher education? On this last point, readers of this paper may wish to reflect on a consideration brought out recently by D. C. Beardslee and Donald O'Dowd, who say:

> . . . there are (college) students who have managed to establish their identity on grounds relatively independent of future occupational status. These fortunate *(sic)* young people are free to test a range of career alternatives for their goodness to fit in the hope of finding maximum play for the

> ego-strength already in their possession. This probably accounts for the academic and personal success of GI Bill student veterans, which is reflected in the nostalgia for the late 40's frequently expressed by faculty members.(4)

A second set of issues raised by the "drift" theory of recruitment to college teaching are the operational ones — *i.e.,* how do we know — when a man drifts into an occupation; what line demarcates the frontier of "career planning" from that of "drift," or does the one shade imperceptibly into the other?

One obvious methodological handicap of both Stecklein-Eckert and Gustad's studies in coming to grips with an operational definition of "drift" is that they are forced to reconstruct the process of career choice by college teachers from the latter's answers to a questionnaire administered ten or more years after they began teaching, in the case of 47 per cent of Stecklein-Eckert's sample and of 67 per cent of Gustad's. Under these circumstances, the answers given by Gustad's sample, for instance, to the question "Do you feel that your decision to enter college teaching was based on: (check) pure chance, mostly chance, mostly planned, careful planning and deliberation?" may reflect something other than these respondents' views of the nature of the events that transpired, or conspired, to cause them to enter college teaching — *at the time when they entered it.* Correspondingly, this reviewer regards Gustad's finding that "over half (the sample) frankly admitted it was a matter of chance" (p. 22), with considerable caution not to say skepticism.

In the first place, so far as the decision to enter *graduate school* is concerned, evidence gathered of career motivations among students applying for or currently engaged in graduate study does not support the "drift" hypothesis. According to Gustad, when the embryo teacher leaves college, "he goes on to graduate work, often without any clear idea about why" (p. 6). However, when Grigg in 1957 asked 84 college seniors in Florida institutions, who said they were planning to take an M. A. degree, why they wanted to go on to graduate school, only 3.8 per cent gave "passive responses"; *i.e.,* "replies which were very vague and which pointed to no specific reason."(5) Of greater or less significance, depending on one's point of view, is the fact that none of the 12 seniors who indicated that they intended to study for the Ph.D. degree gave "passive" responses. On the contrary, the answers of both M.A. and Ph.D. candidates reflected at the very least their awareness of the conventional expectation that one should be able to give a *positive* account of one's *intended* actions* in our

* Note that the same cultural imperative does *not* hold in the case of actions one *has* taken — unless they are very recent. This may be one explanation for the fact that 50 per cent of Gustad's sample said they entered college teaching "by chance."

society (*e.g.*, to meet professional requirements for a job, to make more money, to improve one's proficiency in a subject).

In the second place, evidence gathered from current and recent degree candidates which is said to support the hypothesis of recruitment by "drift" to graduate school, and later to teaching, does not do so in the opinion of this reviewer. Let us examine Berelson's conclusion in his recent study *Graduate Education in the United States:* "Whatever the cause, the effect is the same: going ahead for the doctorate seems to be much less the result of a *decision* and much more the result of drift."[9]

Berelson adduces two pieces of evidence in support of this statement: First, doctoral students' relatively late career choice: "potential doctors and lawyers know much earlier that they want to go ahead for professional training in their field . . . *by* college for medicine, *during* college for law, but only *after* college for doctoral work — that is a sloganized but not over-simplified version of the facts" (p. 143). "Secondly," says Berelson, "the drift hypothesis is confirmed by other data as well." These turn out to be the fact that "recent recipients (of the doctorate) say that no one 'particularly influenced you to go to graduate school'; about two thirds claim they decided 'pretty much on their own' " (p. 143).

This reviewer is at a loss to understand in what way a decision to enter upon graduate or professional education at a median age of 22 rather than of 18 or 20 and the entrant's claim to have decided upon his course of action "pretty much on his own" constitute *prima facie* evidence of having "drifted", either into graduate school or into an occupation — except on the implicit assumption that not to have so drifted means that one must have decided irreversibly on one's occupation at least before college graduation and preferably before college, and that one must *not* have decided on one's future occupation by oneself but at the instigation of some other person(s).

This consideration probably comes close to the heart of the great "drift" controversy. Those who claim that graduate students (or others) drift into college teaching, or into graduate school, or into other educational or occupational areas must do so on the basis of an implicit and highly restrictive model of what constitutes "career planning" and occupational choice." Moreover this reviewer suspects, rightly or wrongly, that their model derives in large part from the mystique of vocational guidance and counseling, particularly of the Ginzberg variety, wherein it is assumed that the only rational (*i.e.*, non-drifting) way to enter into an occupation is via the results of an extensive battery of multiphasic tests, administered in the junior and senior year of high school and interpreted by professional vo-

cational counselors or guidance psychologists. With this assumption, the ghost of Economic Man, whose every action was supposed to reflect the aim of maximizing his self-interest through rational calculus, reapppears in the guise of Vocational Man, whose prime object is to maximize to the last possible percentile point his chances for educational and vocational success. There is only this one difference: whereas Economic Man was at least prepared to take his chances as an individual throughout the course of his abstract career, *Homo Vocatio* is expected to stake his all upon the outcome of a series of standardized, objective tests, scored and interpreted for him in his 17th or 18th year of life. Only then apparently can he be said to enter upon his specialized career training truly as a result of decision rather than of "drift." This assumption may go a long way towards explaining the hostility of vocational guidance specialists to liberal education, noted by Caplow in his statement:[7]

> The advocates of vocational training are often critical of any teaching which is not directly related to a future job. For instance, a recent work discussing the relation of college education to occupational adjustment has this to say: "In fact, even those who were concerned about their occupational future received little direction or guidance. Instead they were frequently encouraged to concentrate in esoteric fields such as French Literature or Philosophy."

Since it is commonly the presumption of professors of Philosophy or of French Literature that they are able to give a man a better idea of who he is and what he should be doing with himself than can tests devised by vocational counselors, the latter's criticism of these esoteric subjects may not be so misdirected after all: for it may be that from the viewpoint of philosophers and French litterateurs, it is only the failure of liberal education which makes possible the success of vocational counseling.

This last consideration bears significantly on the practical question of how formal vocational guidance procedures can be used to recruit students to college faculty roles. For if it is true, as Caplow suggests, that vocational counselors and guidance psychologists on both high school and college levels are hostile to the aims and spirit of liberal education, we may fairly ask what help can be expected from them in the recruitment of teachers for the esoteric subjects in the liberal arts curriculum. On the other hand, to the extent that college faculty members themselves see an antithesis between the aims and spirit of liberal education on the one hand and those of vocational guidance on the other, we may wonder how they can be induced to cooperate in an "improved program of guidance" for the

recruitment of college teachers beyond doing what many probably do already — namely, to try to encourage the one or two students out of 200 or so who show some signs of disinterested intellectual curiosity to persist in their peculiar ways.

Whatever the cogency of these remarks for implementing a practical program of "guidance" to faculty roles is concerned, from the standpoint of research it would appear that the "decision versus drift" schema is an unduly restrictive one in which to study the process of student recruitment to faculty roles. On the one hand, it commits one to a "social problems" approach: *i.e,.* to lay emphasis on the question, what can we do to prevent or reduce "drift"? On the other hand, it would seem to bind study of occupational recruitment to one specific model of how such recruitment *should* take place: *i.e,.* a rationalistic, decision-making model, symbolized by the figure of Vocational Man. On both these grounds, it would seem desirable to approach the study of occupational recruitment, whether to faculty roles or any other, in terms that avoid the conceptual extremes of "occupational decision" on the one hand, "occupational drift" on the other.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

COMMITMENT TO AN OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITY

One way to avoid the impasse of dichotomizing occupational recruitment into processes of "drift" or "decision" has been advanced by Howard Becker. In his paper, "An Analytical Model for Studies of the Recruitment of Scientific Manpower," Becker writes:(9)

> Let me suggest that what is crucial (to occupation recruitment) is not the person's choice of an occupation but rather his eventual commitment to an occupational identity. What needs to be explained . . . is the way people assimilate into their conceptions of themselves an occupational element, the way people come to think of themselves as being, among other things, a member of this occupation or a person who does this kind of work. Working with the concept of commitment focuses our attention on the stability of occupational behavior, pointing us toward research on how people come to stay in an occupation and make it part of their long-term organized plan of behavior.

In line with Becker's remarks, focus on "commitment to an occupational identity" has proved fruitful for analyzing a variety of occupational recruitment processes mediated by adult socialization in professional and graduate schools, such as those of philosophy, physiology, law, or medicine.(9) How does this concept relate to study of the processes which eventuate in recruitment of men and women to college faculty positions, and to their socialization for such roles?

If we ask this question, we are bound to observe that "college teaching" does not, by and large, constitute an occupational identity in our society in the same sense that personal identification is expected with the practice of medicine. Gustad, among others, has remarked on this as a fact. In commenting on the nature of college teachers' identifications as they appeared in his study, he observes that in contrast to identity with teaching or with a particular institution, "more and more the discipline, the professional society, claims the men's allegiance" (p. 34). Alvin Gouldner's findings concerning the relative valence of "cosmopolitan" (*i.e.,* professional) *versus* "local" (*i.e.,* institutional) affiliations among college faculty attest to the same phenomenon.[10]

Why should this be the case, and what problems does this circumstance pose for studying the faculty recruitment process? Recognizing the importance, in terms of manpower recruitment and conservation, of securing commitment to an occupation through identification processes, many educators have deplored this trend to primary identification with an academic discipline on the part of college faculty; and they have proposed to counter it by instituting programs variously conceived as "orientation," "guidance," or "development" for faculty on campus. These programs are frequently justified on grounds that the "undesirable" identifications of faculty members with their disciplines has arisen by default of any efforts on the part of colleges to socialize faculty for performance of academic roles, while the socialization for those roles mediated by graduate schools has tended to stress research functions at the expense of teaching, and loyalty to discipline at the expense of loyalty to institution.

This reasoning, however, overlooks the fact that processes of occupational choice and of the development of occupational identifications do not operate in a vacuum, but take place within the context of a structuring of occupations in a division of labor system, and that this system, with its functional prerequisites, may impose qualifications upon the nature and number of occupations to which commitment by identification is institutionalized—*i.e.,* typically expected as a matter of moral obligation. The trend to disciplinary identification on the part of college faculty, in other words, may not be explicable simply by college administrators' neglect of faculty development programs, nor by the tendency of professional societies to arrogate to themselves proto-union powers of reward or sanction over their members, as Gustad appears to believe.[11]

Seen from the sociological perspective of a division of labor system, the process of recruitment to college teaching or to any other occupation appears as a function of two basic systematic requirements

—allocation and motivation. That is, the system may "require" for its operation adequate methods of allocating personnel as between its different positions; and the persons so allocated "must be" motivated to remain and to perform reliably in those positions. Furthermore, as Linton brought out some years ago, the requirements of allocation and of motivation work at cross-purposes in a division of labor system.[12] To secure the most efficient allocation of personnel, all individuals should ideally be completely interchangeable as among the different positions in the system; while to secure the most effective motivation, they should be prepared, through long training and socialization, for the performance of specialties.

How is this allocation-motivation dilemma resolved in a complex division of labor system highly dependent upon roles that require long periods of training for their performance? One means may be to secure the commitment of individuals to basic occupational identities or statuses through adult socialization processes while sanctioning the expression of these basic identities through a limited variety of occupational roles. The studies of professional and graduate schools referred to earlier show how individuals become committed to basic occupational identies such as "physician," "clergyman," physiologist," etc., as an outcome of adult socialization processes implicit in their graduate education. However, for each of these basic occupational identities, secondary occupational choices, both scalar and functional, are possible and in fact required. Furthermore, there occurs a structuring over time of the roles associated with different statuses into typical career lines.[13]

These remarks call attention to the desirability, for research purposes, of distinguishing between two phases of occupational recruitment: a primary phase wherein persons move into or become allocated as among different basic occupational statuses; and a secondary phase in the course of which the various roles associated with those basic statuses secure their performers. Next, when considering only the phase of primary recruitment, it would appear desirable to make a further distinction between two of its processes: that of "general orientation," which culminates in some overt step to establish candidacy for the status in question; and a process marked by formal procedures designed to turn the status candidate into a full-fledged status occupant. Using military parlance, we may perhaps designate the first process that of "orientation," the second that of "induction." Whereas the process of orientation may be thought of as marked by a wide latitude of individual choice and great variety of social influence, that of induction can be said to reflect a drastic toning down of individual choice, and a high determinism of social influence.

Within this frame of reference, acedemic graduate school training does not in our society typically constitute induction into academic status. In fact, it would be more accurate to speak of "academic roles" than of "academic statuses" and to think of such roles as one sanctioned expression of the status of professional in a specialized scientific or humanistic discipline. Otherwise put, academic roles in our society are generally assumed, and played by, persons who have been inducted through graduate training into the status of professionals in a specialized branch of learning.

These remarks are intended only to set out, in a deductive way, some of the consequences for research on faculty recruitment which arise from a consideration of the variable "commitment to an occupational identity." They may help in understanding why such commitment will always be expected to occur in a selective way in a division of labor system — *i.e.*, why commitment will be expected to certain occupations (*e.g.*, physiologist) but not to others (*e.g.*, college teacher of physiology). They also may serve to call attention to certain largely neglected problems of occupational recruitment.

a) What principles can be invoked to explain, in substantive fashion, which occupations in a division of labor system will be selected as objects of commitment through identification? Concretely, why should academic professions constitute such objects in our society but not academic positions? What mechanisms account for changes over time in occupations considered appropriate for commitment through identification? What degree of consensus exists concerning the occupations regarded as appropriate for personal commitment? What variables account for the consensus which may exist in this respect?

b) What are the processes by which roles appropriate to given basic occupational statuses become defined? What are the mechanisms of proliferation, differentiation, and limitation of these roles?[14]

c) What factors mediate *orientation,* as distinct from induction or socialization, to basic occupational statuses? Two such factors of particular relevance to the study of orientation to the status of professional in a scientific or humanistic discipline may be "the academic image" and "institutional potency." Implicit in consideration of the first factor is the question, To what extent does the image of a role (*e.g.*, "college teacher") associated with a basic occupational status (*e.g.*, "professional in an academic discipline") determine entry into the induction process (*e.g.*, graduate school training) for that basic status? Implicit in consideration of the second factor is the question, To what extent does the environment, however conceptualized, of an undergraduate institution orient its students toward

induction into the status of professional in an academic discipline? In the succeeding sections, this review examines these two factors in detail, as they have been considered in research on the recruitment process for college teachers.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

THE ACADEMIC IMAGE

In attempting to understand why people enter an occupation, a direct relation is often assumed between the "favorableness" of the image that the occupation "projects," and its power to attract "favorable" recruits; at the very minimum, in the more cautious words of two recent students of occupational images:

> It is reasonable to expect that a relationship exists between the degree to which occupational image contains favorable personality and life-style characteristics, the status of the occupation, and the degree to which students would at least, in fantasy, wish to enter it.[18]

Conversely and with particular reference to the academic career, the allegedly unfavorable image which this career projects has been held to be a barrier to the recruitment of future faculty members; so much so that, according to Gustad:

> We need . . . to effect changes in the image of college teaching as a career and college teachers as people. Too long we have permitted and even encouraged . . . the perpetuation of stereotypes, not likely to be useful in attracting young people to teaching (p. 47).

With these remarks we introduce a set of exceedingly complex questions that bear on recruitment to occupational roles such as the college professor. Given the alleged power of "the image" over the

minds and actions of men and given the hopes that are vested in "changing the image" of an occupation as a means of attracting more and better recruits to it, it behooves us to ask: (1) What, empirically, is the "immage" of an occupation or occupational status, such as "college professor," that is held among various groups or categories of individuals, or among the same groups or categories of persons at different times? (2) Why is it, empirically, what it is? (3) What relationship exists between the image of an occupation, among various groups or categories of individuals, and the recruitment of individuals in those groups or categories to that occupation?

Concerning occupational images among college students, the group most likely to provide recruits to college teaching, this review considers two recent studies: O'Dowd and Beardslee, "College Student Images of a Selected Group of Professions and Occupations"[16]; and Mary Kinnane, "Attitudes of College Students Toward College Teaching as a Career."[17] Some of their salient results are reported below, with particular reference to students' images of "the college professor".

1. College students, whether public or private, male or female, exhibit "vast agreement" on images of at least the 15 middle to upper-middle class occupational statuses whose titles were used as stimuli by O'Dowd-Beardslee (p. 121).

2. Very little difference was observed in the images that freshmen and seniors have of the occupational statuses rated by the O'Dowd-Beardslee sample. The tendencies that O'Dowd-Beardslee noted, of image shift from the freshman to the senior year, are of interest from the standpoint of this reviewer and might provide leads for fruitful follow-up. They are described by O'Dowd-Beardslee as follows:

> There is a tendency for seniors compared with freshmen to rate all occupations in less attractive terms. This may be described as a form of senior pessimism.
>
> At both the men's and women's private colleges the college professor is treated differently by freshmen and seniors. In general terms, the seniors have a less exalted view of the professor than freshmen do, but this is not focused on any single evaluative dimension. This difference does not emerge in the state university comparisons.
>
> On the 'cultured intellect' scales the freshmen give higher scores than the seniors to most occupations. In all likelihood, liberal arts training increases the significance of this dimension in the evaluation of occupations.

3. An interesting difference in the image of the college professor, as between public and private college students, was also noted by O'Dowd-Beardslee.

> Compared with the private group the public college students rate him higher in worldly success, personal control and political responsibility, and what appears to be masculine vigor. On the other hand, the private college sample scores him higher on emotional depth and artistic sensibility. He represents greater stability and solidity to the public college undergraduates, while for the private college students the emotional and personal richness of his life is emphasized.

4. College students generally were found to hold a highly favorable image of the college professor. In common with members of many other professional groups, college professors typically spend much of their time complaining of the woeful lack of appreciation that laymen show for the valuable services they render. Only rarely will a member of the professional group in question see through his colleagues' collective representations of self-pity to the actual situation of their social esteem. Riesman, for example, has remarked on the change in student's estimate of the professor's status as compared to that of the businessman in our society; it is his impression that students, at least in leading colleges, exhibit " . . . a posture of contempt for business and a belief that in contrast teaching offers respectability and even integrity."[18]

The studies of both Kinnane and O'Dowd-Beardslee abundantly support these impressions. Kinnane finds a striking difference among college students between the way they think the public perceives the "general stereotype of the college teacher," and their personal judgment of his prestige (p. 30).

> Most college students feel that the general public rates the college teaching profession below medicine and law. Fourteen per cent . . . think most people rate it below business and engineering also . . .
>
> However, collegians do not accept these stereotyped concepts of the professor's status. Fifty-two per cent of them rate it equal to or higher than medicine and law . . . only five percent of student respondents consider college teaching to be of inferior status in relation to business and engineering . . . . (p. 30).

Furthermore, according to Kinnane:

> The conscious dissociation from the stereotyped image of the professor's prestige by the collegians was reinforced

> and spelled out in a number of the interviews. Some students explained that, while they themselves regard the college teacher as a person of high status, this opinion is not shared by their families (p. 31).

From these observations, it would certainly seem that an investigation of students' perceptions of their families' perceptions of occupations, or that of other relevant reference groups, would be most enlightening from the standpoint of understanding the occupational recruitment process. Such an investigation might also shed new light on the opinion-molding function of reference groups. In this case, for example, one could speculate that the image of "the professor" which collegians ascribe to "the public" as a reference group is influenced by their desire to appear superior to "the public" on the dimension of what O'Dowd-Beardslee calls "cultured intellect." Collegians, in effect, may be saying that while the vulgar herd fails to appreciate the professor at his true worth, they of finer sensibility do.

Actually, it turns out that the vulgar herd, or at least the cross-section of it whose opinion about occupations was sampled by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in the spring of 1947, does appreciate the college professor to a degree that must certainly approach the latter's own estimate of his true worth, for the general standing of the college professor was exceeded in that survey by only seven (out of ninety) "occupations": U. S. Supreme Court Justice, Physician, State Governor, U. S. Cabinet Member, U. S. Diplomat, and Mayor of a large city.[19]

Additional evidence of the college professor's truly exalted standing in American society comes from the study of O'Dowd-Beardslee. Even though these authors say that "without any doubt the doctor is a culture hero for college students" (p. 32), "the college professor" heads a list of fifteen occupations in "mean ideal preference score" for Wesleyan men, and he is in a three-way tie for second place as ideal preference of state university men (lawyer was first ideal preference; college professor, doctor, business executive came next).

One explanation for the professor's high standing on the "ideal preference scales" of college men appears from a vignette which O'Dowd-Beardslee distilled from their statistical data on students' occupational images:

> *College Professor* — A dominant feature of this image is the great stress on intellectual competence accompained by sensitivity to artistic or aesthetic experience. The professor is seen as an individual with colorful, interesting, exciting qualities coupled with a degree of rashness, changeability, emotional difficulties and lack of adaptability. It is quite

likely that he is interesting because of his emotional unpredictable nature. In spite of these characteristics and a high score on radicalism he is granted considerable power in public affairs. Students rate the professor as very valuable and they see his role as a source of great personal satisfaction.

On the debit side, according to O'Dowd-Beardslee:

> The professor is described as not well-to-do and lacking in opportunity for advancement . . . . Probably the most striking impression emerging from this profile (of the professor) is its lack of masculinity. It is predominantly a volatile feminine picture with emphasis on intellect, sensitivity, and impulsiveness (p. 34).

By the way of compensation, however, in another section of the study O'Dowd-Beardslee finds that "the college professor is rated higher by women (than by men) in intellectual sophistication, with emphasis on the strong, active, deep, confident masculine facet of this dimension of evaluation" (p. 79).

Given the high status and favorable image that "the college professor" enjoys in the minds of his students coupled with the strong emphasis in American culture on ambition on striving for the highest possible occupational goal, we would expect a very large proportion of American college students to aspire to their master's shoes and seat in the faculty lounge. This expectation is strengthened by Kinnane's finding, that 63 per cent of the New England college students she surveyed responded affirmatively to the question, "Have you ever given serious thought to the possibility of becoming a college teacher?" and that 73 per cent of Ivy League college men gave this response. It is with considerable surprise therefore that one learns from the O'Dowd-Beardslee study of a striking discrepancy between the "ideal" and "real" occupational preferences of college students, so far as their aspirations to college professorhood are concerned. In the case of Wesleyan men, "the college professor" received, as we have seen, the highest mean ideal preference rating; yet real preference for his status was expressed by only 3 per cent of students; whereas "the doctor" and "the business executive," who were second and third in mean ideal preference rank, were the real occupational preference of 19 per cent and 17 per cent, respectively.

This finding brings up the whole question of how, and through what intervening variables, "occupational images" are related to "occupation choices" — a subject which may require much more intensive study than it has so far received. How, for instance, are we to account for the discrepancy between the "ideal" and "real" occupa-

tional preferences of college men with respect to college teaching? According to O'Dowd-Beardslee, this discrepancy "is almost certainly related to the limited rewards and the lengthy training associated with the occupation" (p. 41). On the other hand, a totally different hypothesis seems equally plausible on the strength of the data they themselves present — namely, that college students construct an image of "the professor" which is so demanding in terms of its intellectual and emotional requirements that few students feel they possess realistically the qualifications to live up to it. Proceeding on this assumption, we may raise the further question of whether students construct an image of the college professor which is alien to their "self-concept" because, on grounds totally unrelated to this image, they do not realistically choose to become college professors; or whether they do not choose to become college professors because of the image they have constructed of that occupational status. Are these questions even answerable, and if so, how?

The possibility remains open, nevertheless, that if consumer preferences for automobiles, gasoline, cigarettes, and other commodities can be influenced by the image conceived as an independent variable which these items project, then college student preferences for occupations may be influenced in a similar way. This consideration brings up the problem of explaining the content of occupational images in terms of whatever conceptual dimensions this content is described. From a practical point of view, research on this problem may be expected to throw light on the question of how and to what extent "the image" of an occupation can be "changed."

With reference to this problem, would-be image-changers may have to face up courageously to the possibility that "the image" they wish to alter is based on an accurate, realistic appraisal of its stimulus object. Perhaps most college professors are intellectual giants with volatile feminine characteristics, on the whole not well-to-do, and lacking in opportunities for advancement.

On the other hand, the possibility exists that students' images of "the college professor" are rooted in a reality of a somewhat different order — namely, the functional requirements of the system of social interaction which brings together teachers and students within the formal organizational context of the college. In these terms, students' images of "the professor" would be regarded as an aspect of their institutionalized definition of the professor's role.* According to this logic, one possible line of reasoning would be to say that, given the almost arbitrary power of professors over students so far as grading

* *cf.* Parson's analysis of institutionalized definitions of the roles of doctor and patient within the situation of medical practice: Parsons, T. "The Social System," The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1951, esp. Chapter 10.

is concerned and given the ever-increasing importance of grades to college students, the professor-student relationship can be maintained only if students idealize the intellectual capacities of professors in a way to similar to that reported by O'Dowd-Beardslee in the case of Wesleyan and State University men. On the other hand, the highly personal, subjective aspect of the professor's authority over students may require for its acceptance the institutionalized expectation on the part of students that the professor will be individualistic, emotional, unpredictable in his relations with others generally. Finally, the need that students must feel for protection against the arbitrary authority (and perhaps also the "overwhelming intellect") of professors may generate the institutionalized expectation expressed in the image that men students, at any rate, have of professors — that he be really "weak" so far as his material rewards are concerned; while the same need in the case of women students may lead to the emphasis in their image of "the professor," on his "strong, active, deep, confident, masculine" characteristics as reported by O'Dowd-Beardslee — since such characteristics are supposed, after all, to spell "protection" to a woman.

All this is to be sure the sheerest speculation. Conceivably, however, O'Dowd-Beardslee's finding, that the image which students have of professors changes very little from the freshman to the senior year, could be interpreted as support for this reasoning. It might be interesting to test this hypothesis more rigorously by seeing whether predicted changes in students' images of "the professor" would follow upon specified changes in the patterning of teacher-student interaction.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

INSTITUTIONAL POTENCY AND FACULTY RECRUITMENT

1. Recruitment by Type of Institution

One of the simplest factors to study in its statistical relation to recruitment for faculty careers is at the same time one of the most complex to interpret, so far as its bearing on the recruitment process is concerned. This is the type of undergraduate institution which supplies the graduate schools, and later the college faculties, with their entrants.

On the matter of rate, the broad picture seems abundantly clear, especially since the Knapp-Goodrich and Knapp-Greenbaum studies.[20] Then more the liberal arts are emphasized, particularly in Protestant-founded colleges of the Northeast and Middle West, the more productive the college is of "scientists" and of "younger American scholars." Rogoff has specified this relationship further by making separate analyses of men's (including co-ed) and of women's colleges,[21] since as she says, while liberal arts prevail to a much greater extent at women's colleges, women are much less likely to pursue graduate studies (p. 70). More recently, Berelson has emphasized the qualification that "rates do not staff graduate schools — gross numbers do" (p. 131). Thus "even in Knapp-Greenbaum's figures . . . about two-thirds of the young scholars took their baccalaureate degrees at universities" (p. 131). Berelson further cites from an NORC study which showed that the top eight liberal

arts colleges, from the standpoint of graduate student production, accounted for only 4 per cent of the students who went on to the doctorate during the period 1936-1956 (p. 131).

The implications of the Knapp-Greenbaum studies for recruitment to faculty roles in the future need to be re-examined in the light of a broad social trend towards increase in the number of institutions which Rogoff, following Ostheimer (Statistical Analysis of the Organization of Higher Education in the United States), calls "complex colleges." The term "complex college" "takes cognizance of a transition process typical of many institutions. Some are former teachers colleges or agricultural and mining schools to which a liberal arts curriculum has been added; others are former liberal arts colleges that now offer several undergraduate professional or technical curricula as well" (p. 4). The two most salient characteristics of complex colleges are first, their transitional nature and second, their lack of emphasis on any single curriculum. So classified, complex colleges in 1955 accounted for 20 per cent of all institutions of higher education, as compared to 8 per cent in 1948 (p. 3), and most probably the percentage of college students enrolled in such institutions has increased even more.

It seems important, therefore, to ask what contribution these colleges can make to the graduate student and later faculty population in coming years. Even more important is the question posed by Trow — namely, to what extent will these institutions provide a positive rather than a negative selection of students to graduate school and faculty careers.[22] Because of its heterogeneity, this category of institutions requires further subclassification before our questions can be answered; nevertheless, certain general characteristics which they share provide us with research clues.

First of all, the very transitional nature and complexity of these colleges mean that they lack institutional identity, a fact strikingly brought out in a vignette of one such college, San Francisco State, by Jencks and Riesman.[23] Very often, the place of institutional identity is taken by attachment to a department of instruction — in fact, students at San Francisco State are advised to "think of their department as their home." To the extent that this is true, the processes by which students of differing abilities and orientation become allocated to different departments of instruction within each institution becomes a matter of crucial concern for determining the culture of the department and its consequent valence for recruitment to academic careers. If, for example, the liberal arts departments in a "complex college" become known through these processes as second choice majors relative to the undergraduate professional schools, they

will tend to recruit a progressively weaker type of student, intellectually speaking. To the extent that these are the departments that orient their students to graduate school (possibly because they do not offer training in any marketable skills at the undergraduate level), they will provide a negative selection to education beyond college.

A second consideration relates to the kind of faculty that these institutions attract. Do teachers who have no strong professional identification devolve upon colleges with no strong institutional identity? Is there a danger that this type of faculty member will, in Trow's words, "project an image of college teaching more attractive to timid and less able young men who look to teaching as a way of avoiding the harsh rigors of the business and professional worlds."[34]

2. College Atmospheres

One approach to answering these questions concerning the relative potency of colleges to attract students to academic careers is through consideration of the "atmospheres" or "value climates" which characterize these different kinds of institutions; for, as many studies have indicated,[35] educational processes in a college are mediated not so much in a specific way through contact of students with individual professors and particular courses, but in a more general way through a variable that represents the total world of the college to the students. How is this variable to be (a) defined and (b) ascertained? And what is its relation to academic recruitment?

This section distinguishes between two approaches to the definition and identification of the college world or culture as students experience it. The first, exemplified particularly by the work of George Stern,[36] describes this world as an "environment," defined in terms of various field forces, or "presses" while the relation of students to the environment is conceptualized ecologically as one whereby the personality "needs" of individual organisms (students) and the "presses" of the evironment come into some sort of mutual adjustment. Since this approach to the definition of the college student world is individualistic throughout, it may not be strictly accurate to describe its product as "student culture." In fact, the various student "cultures," "atmospheres" or "environments" that Stern and his colleagues have identified are based on marginal frequencies of student responses to questions concerning the existence or nonexistence of discrete "presses" (*e.g.*, for "abasement," "deference," "order," "humanism," "reflectiveness," etc,) which are presumed to emanate from the college. The degree to which these presses, conceived of as continuous variables, enter into the composition of the "college environment" is then assumed to be a direct function of the frequency with which they are perceived by the student respondents.

Stern does not address himself to the problem of explaining the various press characteristics of different types of institutions, other than to assert the claim that they do not represent a projection of the students' "needs." In his words:

> The characteristics of the student bodies in any of the schools examined thus far reflect need patterns which are readily recognizable as personalized versions of the prevailing press. This is not attributable to the fact that the same students are in general the sources of both sets of data, for there is no relationship between the needs preferences a student records for himself and the press characteristics he attributes to the college either for samples of students at the same institution, or across institutions* (WICHE, p. 89).

Concerning the relation of "college environments" to recruitment for academic careers, Thistlethwaite's study, "College Environments and the Development of Talent," is probably of most direct relevance.[27] Thistlethwaite found systematic differences in faculty behavior items of the College Characteristics Index as reported by National Merit Scholars at colleges of high, as distinct from low, productivity of Ph.D.'s and as between colleges high in the productivity of natural science Ph.D's compared to those high in production of Ph.D.'s in arts, humanities, and social science. As Thistlethwaite himself observes, however, the weakness of this study is that we cannot tell from it whether the differences between colleges in their productivity of different kinds of Ph.D.'s is related to differences in the behavior of their faculty, to differences in the ability and initial motivation of their students to enter graduate study, or to differences in the interaction between these variables. More recently, Astin has attempted to show that the differences between colleges in Ph.D. productivity reported by Thistlethwaite can be referred almost entirely to variables of their student intake, rather than of their "faculty press."[28]

A second approach to the definition of college student worlds is to view them more strictly as cultures, rather than as personalized psychological environments. According to this approach, the impact of the college upon students is mediated through a set of common understandings which students themselves develop about their roles

---

* Since the writer has not seen either of the studies Stern cites in support of this assertion (McFee, A., "The Relation of Selected Factors to Students' Perception of a College Environment," unpublished Master's thesis, Syracuse University, 1959; Dorn, in preparation), he can only say that he finds it hard to believe, particularly in view of the fact that some two pages later in the same article Stern tells us:

> It would appear . . . that the differences in institutional atmosphere reported by . . . various groups of seniors is related in part to their expressed needs . . . . At the present stage of these investigations it remains a moot point as to whether there are in fact three different institutions corresponding to the descriptions of each of these subcultural universities in the same complex university setting, or whether their descriptions more nearly reflect personalized variations of the same underlying theme (WICHE, p. 92).

rather than transmitted directly in the form of "presses" upon their "needs."

Thus in the words of Becker and Geer:

> Although students may interpret and respond to their educational experiences in an individual and idiosyncratic way, this is . . . (not) usually the case. More typically, as they develop common understandings about those interests and activities they share as students and working agreements as to what constitutes proper and reasonable behavior in this role.[29]

Conceived as cultures, the college worlds which students experience can be defined in ideal-typical terms as normative patterns rather than as the values (marginal frequencies) of discrete continuous variables (presses).

One example of student cultures typologically defined is given by Trow in his essay, "The Campus Viewed as a Culture." Trow distinguishes between four types of "dominant forms that student subcultures take on American campuses," generated by the interaction of two sets of normative patterns or values: "involvement with ideas," and "identification with the college."[30]

Identification with college	Involvement with ideas	Type of culture
+	+	academic subculture
+	—	collegiate subculture
—	+	nonconformist subculture
—	—	consumer-vocational subculture

One danger of this method is that it defines only one subculture, the academic, in positive terms by the presence of values, while the other three types of subcultures are left partly or wholly residual. This means in effect that the "collegiate," the "non-conformist" and the "consumer-vocational" subcultures are defined by the standards of the "academic culture" rather than by their own dominant (or substitute) value profiles. Davie and Hare for example show that the "button-down collar" collegiate culture at a men's campus can be characterized by the positive value which students place upon being a "well-rounded man" rather than simply by the lack of primacy which they accord to "involvement with ideas,"[31] Bearing this proviso in mind, however, Trow's typology may be highly useful as a first approach to identification of student subcultures within the academic communities of American colleges.

Going beyond questions of conceptualization, one runs immediately into the thorny problems of technique involved in working with the variable of student subcultures. How do we see a culture when we know it is there? How do we make it visible to others? How do we know a "value" when we see one? What problems may be involved in attempting to reconstruct a culture pattern from individual survey data such as that supplied by the *Activities Index* and *College Characteristics Index?* Since cultures are the properties of interacting groups, should one identify subgroups within a student body (*e.g.*, by sociometric data) before attempting to describe student subcultures? Or would a short-cut to subgroup identification — *i.e.*, use of a panel composed of different kinds of supposedly "representative" students — yield approximately the same picture of campus culture and subulture.[32]

Presuming that these details of technique can be worked out, we may turn to the more significant question of the bearing of student subcultures on recruitment to academic careers. The assumption which grows out of Trow's typology of student subcultures is that: (1) colleges in which the academic subculture predominates or at least, flourishes, provide the most favorable atmosphere for the recruitment of academic men and (2) the vocational subculture, because of its uncouth single-minded emphasis on pelf or sheepskin, provides an atmosphere least likely to encourage the flowering of younger American scholars. In Trow's words:

> . . . where intellectual and aesthetic pursuits are valued for their own sakes, college teaching will appear to be one rewarding way to live out these values and interests, and will appear so especially to these students who have already tasted the rewards of scholarship and scientific inquiry. But on a campus dominated by the values of vocational training, where the college education is seen very largely as a means to other ends, college teaching will be seen as the low status, underpaid and overworked occupation that on those campuses it unhappily too often is.[33]

These remarks concerning the relative potency for the production of academic men, of colleges dominated by academic and by vocational subcultures, seem so self-evident as to require no further elaboration. Nevertheless, they should be examined in the light of certain considerations advanced by Riesman with reference to the Knapp-Greenbaum findings already referred to.

In his article, "The Academic Career: Notes on Recruitment and Colleagueship,"[34] Riesman claims that the pattern of recruitment to scholarship noted by Knapp-Greenbaum no longer applies in our

educational system, mainly, he says, because of the "spread of collegiate values" in our society and because of a change in the social class composition of the undergraduate student bodies at large universities. Although his discussion is concerned with only the potency in production of academic men of small liberal arts colleges relative to that of large universities, a reading of it will in this reviewer's opinion throw light on the kind of recruitment to academic careers that one may expect from the newer "complex colleges" as well.

According to Riesman, the explanation for the "success" earlier in this century of small Midwestern colleges like Hope, Wabash, and Kalamazoo in developing scholars and scientists lay in two main factors: (1) The lack of cosmopolitanism of their student bodies, associated with these students' "generally lower middle-class background" (p. 150). In his words:

> . . . a bright boy from an impoverished background might land in college without ever having heard that one can make a living as a physiologist or an astronomer. But he might have had the luck to encounter in college a teacher who was doing just that . . . . In other words, the very lack of cosmopolitanism of some of these colleges and the lack of cosmopolitanism of the students who went there, meant that a teacher of even moderate quality and interest in his students could accumulate disciples quite readily (p. 150).

(2) The strong anti-intellectual currents in the smaller, mostly Midwestern communities from which scholars came.

> In such a climate of opinion, It was understandable that professors should have been regarded as stuffy, as not quite manly, as occupants of an ivory tower that probably needed dusting. In that climate of opinion, the handful of alienated students would naturally find themselves sympathizing with their college professors, and conversly, the professors would themselves be looking for recruits among the students as hostages against the culture of Babbittry around them (p. 151).

Riesman concludes what we may here call his "Kalamazoo myth" by saying:

> In such a pattern of recruitment into academia, it was plain that not many would be 'called' . . . . As a result, professors could and did spend their time with a few students and tried to deal with the rest by liberally distributing gentlemanly C's. And so it was that those boys from the lower or humbler strata who aspired to become professors would be slowly groomed for that recondite elite (p. 152).

By contrast to the high rate of scholarly production of the Kalamazoos, Riesman claims that "the inferior record in recruitment of scholars from the undergraduate population of the great cosmopolitan universities" could in the past be explained by (1) the cosmopolitanism of their students, which meant that they had many occupational models available other than business or teaching, and (2) the upper-middle to upper class origin of the students which led them to think of an academic career as a downward step in social mobility (p. 150).

The present situation, Riesman thinks, is very different; so that, as he puts it " . . . in the future institutions such as Carleton and St. Olaf's will not show up quite so well as they did in the Wesleyan studies, while Harvard and Yale may show up somewhat better." This is primarily because of two factors which together constitute Riesman's "Harvard myth": (1) A change in the social composition of the student body at large universities — they now include "many relatively poor boys who once would have gone to local and often to denominational colleges" (p. 153). (2) A mutual infiltration of professional (academic) and business values at the large universities which makes the academic career far more attractive and the image of the professor far more glamorous than it used to be in the minds of large university students: "Less and less are professors regarded as members of a small, deviant but semi-elite group — but rather as people who have gone into a business that isn't business" (p. 155). Correspondingly, "the professor . . . has become a man of the world, perhaps traveling on an expense account . . . . Novels now portray him as having sex appeal and even a lurid sex life" (p. 156).

This reviewer has dwelt at some length on Riesman's Kalamazoo and Harvard myths because they appear to constitute a source of significant hypotheses concerning the patterns and processes of recruitment to scholarship by various types of undergraduate institutions. The various propositions implicit in the Harvard myth can of course be tested directly.* But what of the hypotheses implicit in the Kalamazoo myth? Are these to be relegated forever to that intellectual limbo inhabited by similar scientific reconstructions of the dim and distant past, such as Freud's "Totem and Taboo" or Hoyle's "Cosmology"? This reviewer thinks not, for the good and simple reason that much of the stuff of which the Kalamazoo myth is made may be found on the campuses of contemporary "complex colleges," such as

* For example, the proposition that to use Trow's words "in our best colleges, college teaching appeals to the best students in a highly talented student body" (Trow, NEBHE, p. 61) — on this point, see Marcson's "The Scientist in American Industry," Princeton, 1960. "The best university graduates go to the universities rather than come to the industrial research laboratories." As a result, the industrial laboratories " . . . are only able to attract the next to the very top of a graduating class" (p. 54). Concerning hypotheses about the changing image of the college professor, see section on image research, this paper.

San Francisco State or Georgia State. True, these are urban, rather than rural institutions; also true is the fact that they are very large, and given over to professional as well as to liberal arts training. But they would appear to flourish in an anti-intellectual atmosphere; their students are predominantly of a provincial lower-middle class origin; their professors are dichotomized into start-outs and cooled-outs,[∞] both types plausibly motivated like those at Kalamazoo to "look for recruits among students as hostages against the culture of Babbittry around them."

Thus it may be true as Trow suggests that a polarization of American colleges into the selective and unselective, the academic and the vocational, is taking place today — one symptom of this being the rise of "complex colleges." It may also be true that two very different processes of recruitment to future faculty roles will go on in these two kinds of institutions. But to the extent that the Kalamazoo myth finds incarnation or reincarnation in the complex colleges of today, it may not be true that the future academic men these colleges recruit will be drawn from the ranks of their poorer students.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

REFERENCES

1. Gustad, John W. *The Career Decisions of College Teachers.* (SREB Research Monograph Series No. 2). Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, November, 1960.
2. Stecklein, John E. and Eckert, Ruth E. *An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career.* Washington, D. C.: Cooperative Research Program, U. S. Office of Education, January 1958. See also: Eckert, Ruth E. and Stecklein, John E. *Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers: A Study of Faculty Members in Minnesota Colleges.* (Cooperative Research Monograph No. 7). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
3. Trow, Martin A. "Reflections on the Recruitment to College Teaching" in *Faculty Supply, Demand, and Recruitment: Proceedings of a Regional Conference.* Winchester, Massachusetts: New England Board of Higher Education, 1959. p. 54.
4. Beardslee, David C. and O'Dowd, Donald D. "Students and the Occupational World" in Sanford, Nevitt, editor. *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962. p. 604.
5. Grigg, Charles M., "Who Wants to Go to Graduate School, and Why?" Center for Social Research, Florida State University, *Research Report in Social Science,* II, No. 1., February, 1959, p. 7.
6. Berelson, Bernard. *Graduate Education in the United States,* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960. p. 143.

7. Caplow, Theodore. *The Sociology of Work*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954. p. 219.
8. Becker, Howard S. "An Analytical Model for Studies of the Recruitment of Scientific Manpower" in *Scientific Manpower, 1958: Papers of the Seventh Conference on Scientific Manpower*. Washington, D. C.: National Science Foundation, 1959. pp. 75-79.
9. See for example: Becker, Howard S., *et al. Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. XIV, p. 456; Merton, Robert K., *et al. The Student-Physican: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957. XI, p. 360; Lortie, Don C. "Laymen to Lawmen: Law School, Careers, and Professional Socialization," *Harvard Educational Review* 29, No. 4 (Fall, 1959), pp. 352-370.
10. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2 (December, 1957 and March, 1958), pp. 281-306 and 444-480.
11. Gustad. *op. cit.*, p. 35.
12. Linton, Ralph. *The Study of Man.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1936, p. 503.
13. See in this connection Becker, Howard S. and Straus, A. "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization,"*American Journal of Sociology* 62:3 (November, 1956), pp. 253-263.
14. *cf.*, Smith, Harvey L."Contingencies of Professional Differentiation," *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (1957-58), pp. 410 ff.
15. O'Dowd, Donald D. and Beardslee, David C. "College Student Images of a Selected Group of Professions and Occupations." Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, Incorporated, April, 1960.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Kinnane, Mary. "Atttitudes of College Students Toward College Teaching as a Career," *The Educational Record* 43:2 (April, 1962), pp. 139-147.
18. Riesman, David, "The Academic Career: Notes on Recruitment and Colleagueship," *Daedalus* (Winter, 1959), pp. 147-169.
19. National Opinion Research Center. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation" in Bendix, B. and Lipset, Seymour M. *Class, Status and Power.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1947. p. 412. See also in this connection Lipset, Seymour M. "The Real Status of American Intellectuals" in deHuszar, George B., editor. *The Intellectuals.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960. pp. 510-516.

20. Knapp, R. H. and Goodrich, H. B. *Origins of American Scientists: A Study Made under the Direction of a Committee of the Faculty of Wesleyan University.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952. XIV, p. 450; Knapp, Robert H. and Greenbaum, Joseph J. *The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953. XIV, p. 122.

21. Rogoff, N. "Board Member Colleges." New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, May, 1957. pp. 77-79.

22. Trow, Martin. *Ibid.* pp. 60-61.

23. Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. "A Vignette of San Francisco State College" included in "The Viability of the American College," Chapter 3 in Sanford, Nevitt, editor. *The American College.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 158-179.

24. Trow, NEBHE. *op. cit.*, p. 63.

25. Newcomb, Theodore M. *Personality and Social Change.* New York: Dryden Press, 1943. p. 225; Jacob, Philip E. *Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. XVI, p. 174; Barton, Allen H. *Studying the Effects of College Education: A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in College.* New Haven, Connecticut: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959. p. 96; Bidwell, Charles E., editor. *The American College and Student Personality: A Survey of Research Progress and Problems.* Andover, Massachusetts: Social Science Research Council (Committee on Personality Development in Youth), 1960. V, p. 70.

26. See for example: Stern, George G. "Congruence and Dissonance in the Ecology of College Students," *Student Medicine* 8 (1960), pp. 304-339; Stern, George G. "The Ecology of the American College Student: Varieties of Constraint in American Education." Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959. (mimeo); Stern, George. "Student Values and Their Relationship to the College Environment" in Sprague, Hall T., editor. *Research on College Students: Institute Lectures Considering Recent Research on College Students' Motivation, Values and Attitudes, and Campus Cultures.* Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, December, 1960. pp. 67-104; Stern, George G. *"Environments for Learning"* in Sanford, Nevitt, editor. *The American College.* New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962. pp. 690-730.

27. Thistlethwaite, Donald C. "College Environments and the Development of Talent," *Science* 130 (July 10, 1959), pp. 71-76.

28. Astin, A. W. "A Re-examination of College Productivity," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 52:3 (1961), pp. 173-178; Astin, A. W. "Productivity of Undergraduate Institutions," *Science* (April 13, 1962), pp. 129-135. See also rejoinder by Thistlethwaite, Donald L. "Fields of Study and Development of Motivation to Seek Advanced Training," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 53:2 (April, 1962), pp. 53-64.

29. Becker, Howard S. and Geer, Blanche, "Student Culture in Medical School," *Harvard Educational Review* 28:1 (Winter, 1958), p. 70.

30. Trow, Martin. "The Campus Viewed as a Culture" in *Research on College Students*. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, December, 1960. pp. 105-123.

31. Davie, J. S. and Hare, A. P. "Button-Down Collar Culture: A Study of Undergraduate Life at a Man's College," *Human Organization*. (1956), pp. 13-20.

32. *cf.*, Becker, Howard S. "Interviewing Medical Students," *American Journal of Sociology* 62:2 (September, 1956), pp. 199-201.

33. Trow, NEBHE. *loc. cit.*, p. 63; Becker, Howard S. and Geer, Blanche. "Participant Observation and Interviewing," *Human Organization* 16:3 (1958); Hartshorne, E. Y. "Undergraduate Society and the College Culture," *American Sociological Review* 8 (1943).

34. Riesman, *loc. cit.*

35. Goffman, E. "On Cooling the Mark Out: Some Aspects of Adaptation to Failure," *Psychiatry* 15:4 (November, 1952).

APPENDIX

Participants

CONFERENCE ON FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION RESEARCH

Ida Cason Callaway Gardens
Pine Mountain, Georgia
May 14-16, 1961

Mrs. Lucile Allen
Educational Consultant
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

Howard S. Becker
Community Studies, Inc.
724 Railway Exchange Building
Kansas City 6, Missouri

Orville G. Brim, Jr.
Sociologist and Assistant Secretary
Russell Sage Foundation
505 Park Avenue
New York 22, New York

John K. Folger
Associate Director
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Charles M. Grigg, Director
Institute for Social Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

John W. Gustad, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
Alfred University
Alfred, New York

Robert L. Lathrop
Research Associate
Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Ward S. Mason, Head
Teacher Personnel Statistics
U. S. Office of Education
Washington 25, D. C.

Nahum Z. Medalia
Associate Professor of Sociology
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

Jerry L. L. Miller
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Emory University
Atlanta 22, Georgia

Charles B. Nam
Education Analyst
Population Division
Bureau of the Census
U. S. Department of Commerce
Washington 25, D. C.

Donald D. O'Dowd
Associate Professor of Psychology
Michigan State University at
Oakland
Rochester, Michigan

Peter H. Rossi, Director
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

E. F. Schietinger
Research Associate
Southern Regional Education
Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Richard L. Simpson
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Hall T. Sprague, Staff Associate
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Martin A. Trow
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of California
206 South Hall
Berkeley 4, California

Kenneth M. Wilson
Research Associate
Southern Regional Education
Board
Atlanta, Georgia